

The meeting was called to order by President John Christensen at 7:15 p.m. in the Montana Rooms of the University Center.

Corrections to minutes: Tom Cannon is on the Implementation of the Caucus's Resolution Committee instead of Mozer. All 7 Divisions of the bylaws were accepted by CB instead of 5. On the Loan Fund for Overseas Study, Paddock corrected the minutes to read "If CB set up a loan or scholarship fund for \$500 per student it would cost about \$1500 for 2 to 3 people." Beck said "Contrary to last week's minutes Leroy Berven does not exist." Last but not least, please strike from the records and spit into the ground the very repugnant phrase "to get Governor Anderson out of office."

REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Publications Board: Thornton said that Dick Madsen is looking into the cost, etc. of printing a handbook.

Dean's Study Group: Thornton said this committee prepared a list of questions to be given to Vice President Mitchell at their next meeting which depended upon Mitchell's commitment.

Curriculum Committee: Mike McKenzie said that after the general university group requirements were abolished by Faculty Senate last Spring, it was their apparent intention that each individual department establish their own supplemental requirements necessary in developing a foundation of discipline which would support the actual major requirements within the department. Major requirement for a degree is 45 credits. In addition, a certain number of supplementary courses outside the major must be taken to give the student a broad foundation upon which to build his major. Previously these supplementary courses were incorporated into the group requirements, but now Faculty Senate wants each department to handle their own supplementary requirements. In some cases a department might have the tendency to make supplementary courses so stringent that they exceed group requirements, therefore making it hard or impossible for some students to get a degree. Sometimes as many as 120 special credits were needed to get a degree. The Curriculum Committee would like to limit the total requirements (departmental and supplementary) to 70 credits, and to make sure that supplementary requirements don't get so heavy that they prevent a student from making his own choice in regard to subjects.

OLD BUSINESS

National Student Lobby: At the last CB meeting, Swenson reported on the purposes of the N.S.L. Information was available to interested members in the ASUM office and a decision was to be made this meeting. SWENSON MOVED THAT CB ALLOCATE \$50.00 TO JOIN N.S.L. MCKENZIE SECONDED AND MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL IN FAVOR.

Kaimin Funding Committee: Servheen said the committee met with Kaimin representatives and discussed possible alternatives to Kaimin funding. Next meeting the Kaimin will present a budget covering the next few years and decide if it will be necessary to go through the Board of Regents to permanently earmark part of the student activity fee for Kaimin funding.

Resolution on Athletic Budget: Swenson submitted a resolution to CB regarding the Athletic Department budget. SWENSON MOVED WHEREAS CENTRAL BOARD OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA HAS DETERMINED THAT THE ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT BUDGET MUST BE FINANCED IN A MORE EQUITABLE MANNER, WHEREAS CENTRAL BOARD HAS BEGUN TO TAKE STEPS TO RECTIFY THE PRESENT SITUATION AND IS COMMUNICATING WITH STUDENTS IN THE OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF THE BIG SKY CONFERENCE, WHEREAS THE PROPOSED

(over)

February 16, 1972

CHANGES (AS STATED IN THE RESOLUTION ON FINANCING VARSITY ATHLETICS AS PASSED BY CENTRAL BOARD ON FEBRUARY 2, 1972) AFFECT THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA AS MUCH AS THE STUDENTS AND WOULD BENEFIT THE FACULTY AS MUCH AS THE STUDENTS; CENTRAL BOARD HEREBY STRONGLY URGES THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA AND ALL OTHER FACULTY MEMBERS TO DO THE FOLLOWING: (1) PRESSURE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIVERSITY TO ADOPT AN ECONOMICALLY REALISTIC POLICY TOWARD FUNDING VARSITY ATHLETICS -- IF NECESSARY THIS POLICY SHOULD INCLUDE ELIMINATION OF THE FOOTBALL AND/OR BASKETBALL PROGRAM IF THAT PROGRAM CANNOT SUPPORT ITSELF, (2) ESTABLISH COMMUNICATION WITH EQUIVALENT FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHER FACULTY MEMBERS AT THE OTHER UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN THE BIG SKY CONFERENCE TO DETERMINE FACULTY SENTIMENT THROUGHOUT THE CONFERENCE ABOUT VARSITY ATHLETIC BUDGETING WITH THE HOPEFUL RESULT OF CONFERENCE-WIDE REDUCTIONS. MOZER SECONDED. DISCUSSION FOLLOWED. Cynthia Schuster asked that the letter to the students of the Big Sky Conference be read before voting as it explains the situation. The letter read as follows: "Among the students at the University of Montana there has been a rising sentiment that the varsity athletics program should be funded on a different basis, specifically, that the program should be self-supporting. Many students have the feeling that varsity sports have been emphasized at the expense of academics. We hope students on your campus also feel the time is ripe for a radical change in methods of financing varsity athletics. If so, we shall propose to Central Board, the student government at the University of Montana, that it attempt to initiate a meeting of student representatives to work out plans for a conference-wide decommercializing of intercollegiate sports. Through conference-wide reductions many costs can be mostly, if not entirely, eliminated. Expenses such as scholarships and recruiting are absolutely unnecessary if the Big Sky Conference as a whole should decide to exclude them from allowable expenses for varsity athletics. Some indicators of the aforementioned sentiment are the following: -- during Spring Quarter of 1971 a student referendum was held in which 82 percent of those voting favored allocation of \$147,000 of student money to the varsity athletic budget rather than the \$173,000 allocated by the immediate past student government (\$147,000 was the minimum allocation allowed by University regulations), -- an opinion poll taken in conjunction with registration for Winter Quarter of 1972 had the following result -- of those expressing an opinion a 2 to 1 majority favored a pay-as-you-go system for football and basketball, i.e. they favored no money be directly allocated from student funds to the football and basketball programs, and those students who go to the games would be charged when they went, and -- Central Board recently passed a resolution which encouraged placing football and basketball on a pay-as-you-go basis and the elimination of either program if it could not support itself on this basis. The main purpose of this letter is to ascertain whether or not such sentiment is present on your campus. Please send any comments you may have to the following address: Bruce Swenson, ASUM Office, University of Montana, Missoula, Montana 59801. We cannot make any commitments for present or future student governments, but we urgently implore you to respond to this letter as soon as possible." Swenson said that a copy of this letter would be sent to every school in the Big Sky Conference and to each school newspaper. Swenson said that they would like to influence the schools to hold an opinion poll and also to make the students aware of this subject. MCKENZIE AMENDED THE MAIN MOTION TO INCLUDE APPROVAL OF THE LETTER. BERVEN SECONDED AND AMENDMENT TO MAIN MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL IN FAVOR. MAIN MOTION TO APPROVE SWENSON'S RESOLUTION AS AMENDED TO INCLUDE LETTER PASSED WITH ALL IN FAVOR.

Letter from KYLT: President Christensen submitted a letter sent to him by KYLT regarding CB's complaint on editorials influencing students to vote for an increase in athletic funding. Members felt that the letter was a satisfactory response and that the issue would not be further provoked.

(more)

February 16, 1972

MONTPIRG: Jim Walsh, president of MONTPIRG said he is thinking about getting the universities in Missoula, Bozeman and Billings to join this organization before going to the Board of Regents for funding. He requested that CB sign a resolution which could be presented to President Pantzer, stating that CB endorse the principle of the Montana Public Interest Group; to allow the organizers of the Montana Public Interest Group to use this endorsement in promoting the local chapter and the state organization, to be known as the Montana Public Interest Research Group; to request and to obtain permission from President Pantzer of the University of Montana to use the necessary administrative means to petition the University of Montana students, employing the registration process, similar to the athletic poll taken during winter registration, for acceptance and funding of the Montana Public Interest Research Group. FLAHERTY MOVED THAT CB SIGN A RESOLUTION FOR PRESIDENT PANTZER ENDORSING MONTPIRG AND REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE ADMINISTRATIVE MEANS TO PETITION STUDENTS THROUGH REGISTRATION PROCESS FOR ACCEPTANCE AND FUNDING OF MONTPIRG. SERVHEEN SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL IN FAVOR.

Student Government Convention in Great Falls: President Christensen said he answered the letter as explained in last week's CB meeting expressing interest in this convention but has received no reply as yet. Since the temporary date for this has been set February 25 and 26, there is still time to make a final decision, in the event this convention does take place.

NEW BUSINESS

Activity privileges: Dana requested that something be done about students having their activity cards taken away after dropping out of school in the middle of a quarter. Dana said that President Pantzer saw no reason why action should not be taken on this. DANA MOVED THAT STUDENTS WHO DROPPED OUT OF SCHOOL MID-QUARTER BE ABLE TO RETAIN ACTIVITY CARD UNTIL END OF QUARTER. BERVEN SECONDED. Cynthia Schuster thought possibly the activity card could be retained after a student dropped out with the exclusion of voting and library privileges. DANA MOVED TO AMEND MAIN MOTION TO ALLOW DROPOUT STUDENTS TO RETAIN ACTIVITY CARD UNTIL THE END OF THE QUARTER, TO EXCLUDE VOTING AND LIBRARY PRIVILEGES. BERVEN SECONDED AND AMENDMENT TO MAIN MOTION PASSED WITH ALL IN FAVOR.

Emergency Conference for New Voters: President Christensen reported on this conference which he attended in Chicago last December 3 - 5. The purpose of this conference was to form a youth caucus which in coordination with the already formed black and women's caucuses will coordinate national efforts to select enough delegates to the nominating convention to see that a candidate acceptable to the young and poor of America is nominated. Christensen said that each group formed their own private caucuses and the convention was not unified. He would have liked to attend more workshops but there wasn't time. He attended workshops on fund training and voter registration. Christensen talked about getting Mrs. Autio and Jackie Hunt to hold a workshop on the proper way to fill out registration cards. Since elections are June 6 there is time to encourage students - especially freshmen. Christensen passed out typed information on how to become a delegate to the democratic convention, Republican delegate selection process, commission on party structure and delegate selection, and resolutions passed by the National Youth Caucus.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Mozer said the Off-Campus Housing Committee would meet Thurs., Feb. 24 Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

PRESENT: Anderson, Beck, Berven, Dana, Ehrlich, Flaherty, Grande, McKenzie, Mozer, Owens Paddock, Ridgeway, Servheen, Swenson, Sorenson, Smith, Vick

EXCUSED: Cook, Fouty, Gilbert, Cannon

Respectfully submitted, Ruby Biondich
ASUM Secretary

Ruby Biondich

February 14, 1972

Mr. Joe Durham
City Building Inspector
City of Missoula
Missoula, Montana 59801

Dear Mr. Durham:

In November of last year we asked for and received from you a questionnaire to determine the type of quality of off-campus housing used by students. We have now received the completed questionnaires from the students and have compiled the enclosed statistics and evaluation.

We sincerely hope that this information will be as enlightening to you as it is to us.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Mozer
Chairman, Off-Campus Housing Committee
Associated Students of the University of Montana

TJM/rb
Enclosures

THIS LETTER SENT TO Mr. Joe Durham, City Building Inspector
Mr. M. Fite, City Fire Marshall
Mr. Dave Crow, City-County Planning Director
Mr. E. J. Biniek, Housing and Zoning Coordinator
Miss Candy Fetscher, City Planning Board

February 14, 1972

Mr. M. Fite
City Fire Marshall
City of Missoula
Missoula, Montana 59801

Dear Mr. Fite:

In November of last year we asked for and received from you a questionnaire to determine the type of quality of off-campus housing used by students. We have now received the completed questionnaires from the students and have compiled the enclosed statistics and evaluation.

We sincerely hope that this information will be as enlightening to you as it is to us.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Mozer
Chairman, Off-Campus Housing Committee
Associated Students of the University of Montana

TJM/rb
Enclosures

THIS LETTER SENT TO Mr. Joe Durham, City Building Inspector
Mr. M. Fite, City Fire Marshall
Mr. Dave Crow, City-County Planning Director
Mr. E. J. Biniek, Housing and Zoning Coordinator
Miss Candy Fetscher, City Planning Board

Feb. 16

Whereas, Central Board of the Associated Students of the University of Montana has determined that the Athletic Department budget must be financed in a more equitable manner,

Whereas, Central Board has begun to take steps to rectify the present situation and is communicating with students in the other institutions of the Big Sky Conference,

Whereas, the proposed changes (as stated in the resolution on financing varsity athletics as passed by Central Board on February 2, 1972) affect the faculty of the University of Montana as much as the students and would benefit the faculty as much as the students;

Central Board hereby strongly urges the Faculty Senate of the University of Montana and all other faculty members to do the following:

- (1) Pressure the administration of the university to adopt an economically realistic policy toward funding varsity athletics -- if necessary this policy should include elimination of the football and/or basketball program if that program cannot support itself,
- (2) Establish communication with equivalent faculty organizations and other faculty members at the other universities and colleges in the Big Sky Conference to determine faculty sentiment throughout the conference about varsity athletic budgeting with the hopeful result of conference-wide reductions.

Submitted by Bruce Swenson

An open letter to the students of the Big Sky Conference:

Among the students here at the University of Montana there has been a rising sentiment that the varsity athletics program should be funded on a different basis, specifically, that the program should be self-supporting. Many students have the feeling that varsity sports have been emphasized at the expense of academics.

We hope students on your campus also feel the time is ripe for a radical change in methods of financing varsity athletics. If so, we shall propose to Central Board, the student government at the University of Montana, that it attempt to initiate a meeting of student representatives to work out plans for a conference-wide decommercializing of intercollegiate sports.

Through conference-wide reductions many costs can be mostly, if not entirely, eliminated. Expenses such as scholarships and recruiting are absolutely unnecessary if the Big Sky Conference as a whole should decide to exclude them from allowable expenses for varsity athletics.

Some indicators of the aforementioned sentiment are the following:

- - during Spring Quarter of 1971 a student referendum was held in which 82 percent of those voting favored allocation of \$147,000 of student money to the varsity athletic budget rather than the \$173,000 allocated by the immediate past student government (\$147,000 was the minimum allocation allowed by University regulations),
- - an opinion poll taken in conjunction with registration for Winter Quarter of 1972 had the following result -- of those expressing an opinion a 2 to 1 majority favored a pay-as-you-go system for football and basketball, i.e. they favored no money be directly allocated from student funds to the football and basketball programs, and those students who go to the games would be charged when they went, and
- - Central Board recently passed a resolution which encouraged placing football and basketball on a pay-as-you-go basis and the elimination of either program if it could not support itself on this basis.

The main purpose of this letter is to ascertain whether or not such sentiment is present on your campus.

Please send any comments you may have to the following address: Bruce Swenson, ASUM Office, University of Montana, Missoula, Montana 59801.

We cannot make any commitments for present or future student governments, but we urgently implore you to respond to this letter as soon as possible.

Members of the committee appointed by the ASUM President to implement the enclosed resolution.

February 17, 1972

Mr. Gerald Stiffarm
1616 Wyoming
Missoula, Montana 59801

Dear Gerald:

Please advise us as to your position concerning the Curriculum Committee. If you no longer intend to be on it we will want to appoint someone to replace you.

This committee meets every Monday and Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. It will not meet next Monday only (February 21) as this is a holiday.

Sincerely,

John Christensen
ASUM President

JC/rb

President Robert T. Pantzer

John R. Christensen, ASUM President

Summer Employment of ASUM Program Council Director, President,
Vice President and Business Manager.

Recently we discussed the possibility of the ASUM President, Vice President, Business Manager and Program Council Director working on campus during the summer months. The source of funding we proposed would be the summer activity fee and three or more employing departments and the Associated Students of the University of Montana's annual budget. Hopefully, each officer's salary would be financed one-third by an employing department, one-third by the summer activity fee, and one-third by ASUM's budget. We have discussed this possibility with the Business Manager of the University, Cal Murphy and the possibility of our business manager working with him. He has tentatively agreed. We have discussed it also with Ray Chapman, University Center Director, and he has agreed. The Dean's office has also given tentative approval to have one of the officers work in his office.

The cost would run approximately (through rough estimates) \$500.00 per month for three months for the four people or in the neighborhood of \$6,000.00 total. Hopefully, ASUM could pick up around \$2,000.00 of this total; perhaps \$1,500.00 could be obtained from the summer activity fee, with the Program Director working full time with Walter Schwank. The other \$2,500.00 could be picked up by the other three employing departments. I feel that this would be very feasible. I do not think that the total cost to each department will be too great of a burden for what I do believe the officers could add or input into the various employing departments.

So, as it stands now, we have tentatively three employing departments. We have not, as of yet, received confirmation from Walter Schwank and in the near future we will be discussing it with him. Some other possibilities of employing departments we felt could be the President's office, Information Services, and the Alumni Center. We have not as yet discussed this with them.

Hopefully, the program can be instituted in this coming summer. I do not think it should be a permanent program and we'll have to review the program year by year and see how everything works out. I think that it would be a valuable asset both to the administration and the faculty along with the student government to have these people employed on the campus during the summer. I think it would help to establish good rapport and hopefully the students would take their jobs seriously and be an added and valuable input to the University.

CC: Ray Chapman
Dean Fedore
Cal Murphy
Walter Schwank

asum

BOB SORENSON • Business Manager / GREG BECK • Vice President / JOHN CHRISTENSEN • President

We, the Associated Students of the University of Montana,
acting through the duly elected student representatives,
this 16th day of February, 1972, do resolve:

- 1) to endorse the principle of the Montana Public Interest Group;
- 2) to allow the organizers of the Montana Public Interest Group to use this endorsement in promoting the local chapter and the state organization, to be known as the Montana Public Interest Research Group;
- 3) to request and to obtain permission from President Pantzer of the University of Montana to use the necessary administrative means to petition the University of Montana students, employing the registration process, similar to the athletic poll taken during winter registration, for acceptance and funding of the Montana Public Interest Research Group.

Sincerely,

John R. Christensen (for Central Board)
ASUM President

HOW TO BECOME A DELEGATE TO THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

PART I - INTRODUCTION

The following Guidelines for delegate selection represent the Commission's interpretation of the "full, meaningful, and timely" language of its mandate. These Guidelines have been divided into three general categories.

- A. Rules or practices which inhibit access to the delegate selection process -- items which compromise full and meaningful participation by inhibiting or preventing a Democrat from exercising his influence in the delegate selection process.
- B. Rules or practices which dilute the influence of a Democrat in the delegate selection process, after he has exercised all available resources to effect such influence.

C. Rules and practices which have some attributes of both A and B.

A. Rules or practices inhibiting access:

1. Discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color or national origin.
2. Discrimination on the basis of age or sex.
3. Voter registration.
4. Costs and fees
5. Existence of Party Rules.

B. Rules or practices diluting influence:

1. Proxy voting
2. Clarity of purpose.
3. Quorum provisions.
4. Selection of alternates; filling of delegate and alternate vacancies.
5. Unit rule.
6. Adequate representation of political minority views.
7. Apportionment.

C. Rules and practices combining attributes of A and B:

1. Adequate public notice.
2. Automatic (ex-officio) delegates.
3. Open and closed processes
4. Premature delegate selection (timeliness).
5. Committee selection processes.
6. Slate-making.

PART II - EXPLANATION OF TERMS

In each of its official guidelines, the Commission uses one of two terms: "require" or "urges". The choice of the term in each case indicates the nature of the Commission's disposition of that guideline.

The term "requires" means that the stated purpose is within the "full, meaningful and timely opportunity" mandate of the 1968 Convention, and that the Commission considers the accomplishment of the stated purpose to be the minimum action State Parties must take to meet the requirements of the Call of the 1972 Convention.

The use of the term "requires" parallels the term "minimum prerequisites" which was used by the Special Equal Rights Committee in explaining the binding effect of its Six Basic Elements. The word "requires" should not imply that the Commission has any direct enforcement power. The Commission does, however, have the authority from the National Convention, the sovereign body in party affairs -- just as the Special Equal Rights Committee had in 1968 -- to recommend that the Credentials Committee declare vacant the seats of a delegation chosen in a manner inconsistent with the Commission Guidelines and, if a rival delegation has satisfied the Commission Guidelines, fill those seats with such a delegation.

The term "urges" means that the stated purpose is within the Commission's mandate, that the Commission considers the accomplishment of the stated purpose by the State Parties to be desirable, but that the Commission is not prepared to require such action before the 1972 Convention.

When the adoption, repeal or amendment of a provision of the State Law or State Constitution is necessary to accomplish the stated purpose, the Commission expects State Parties to make "all feasible efforts" to accomplish such purpose. "All feasible efforts" means that the State Party will be obliged to show that it has held hearings, introduced bills, worked for their enactment, and amended its rules in every necessary way short of exposing the party of its members to legal sanctions.

The Commission recommends that in the event of any contest or challenge involving an allegation or failure to fulfill the provisions to the following Guidelines, the Credentials Committee of the 1972 Democratic National Convention be guided by the principle that State Parties must assume the burden of ensuring opportunities for full, meaningful and timely participation in the delegate selection process for party members.

The commission believes that the specifications of these Guidelines will not be satisfied if the effects of full and meaningful participation at an early stage of the delegate selection process are compromised or overturned at a later stage in the process with full and meaningful influence in relevant decisions taken at prior states. Therefore, it is the understanding of the Commission that these Guidelines apply equally to all stages of the delegate selection process.

Futthermore, it is the understanding of the Commission that the Guidelines apply to the selection of alternates as well as delegates to the National Convention.

PART III - THE GUIDELINES

A-1 Discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin

The 1964 Democratic National Convention adopted a resolution which conditioned the seating of delegations at future conventions on the assurance that discrimination in any State Party affairs on the grounds of race, color, creed or national origin did not occur. The 1968 Convention adopted the 1964 Convention resolution for inclusion in the Call to the 1972 Convention. In 1966, the Special Equal Rights Committee, which had been created in 1964, adopted six anti-discrimination standards -- designated as the "six basic elements"* -- for the State Parties to meet. These standards were adopted by the Democratic National Committee in January 1968 as its official policy statement.

1. All public meetings of all levels of the Democratic Party in each State should be open to all members of the Democratic Party regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.
2. No test for membership in, nor any oaths of loyalty to, the Democratic Party in any State should be required or used which has the effect of requiring prospective or current members of the Democratic Party to acquiesce in, condone or support discrimination on the grounds of race, color, creed, or national origin.
3. The time and place for all public meetings of the Democratic Party on all levels should be publicized fully and in such a manner as to assure timely notice to all interested persons. Such meetings must be held in places accessible to all Party members and large enough to accommodate all interested persons.
4. The Democratic Party on all levels, should support the broadest possible registration without discrimination on grounds of race, color, creed, or national origin.
5. The Democratic Party in each State should publicize fully and in such manner as to assure notice to all interested parties a full description of the legal and practical procedures for selection of Democratic Party Officers and Representatives on all levels. Publication of these procedures should be done in such fashion that all prospective and current members of each state Democratic Party will be fully and adequately informed of the pertinent procedures in time to participate in each selection procedure at all levels of the Democratic Party organization.
6. The Democratic Party in each State should publicize fully and in such manner as to assure notice to all interested parties a complete description of the legal and practical qualifications for all officers and representatives of the State Democratic Party. Such publication should be done in timely fashion that all prospective candidates or applicants for any elected or appointed position within each State Democratic Party will have full and adequate opportunity to compete for office.

These actions demonstrate the intention of the Democratic Party to ensure a full opportunity for all minority group members to participate in the delegate selection process. To supplement the requirements of the 1964 and 1968 Conventions, the Commission requires that:

1. State Parties add the six basic elements of the Special Equal Rights Committee to their Party rules and take appropriate steps to secure their implementation.
2. State Parties overcome the effects of past discrimination by affirmative steps to encourage minority group participation, including representation of minority groups on the national convention delegation in reasonable relationship to the group's presence in the population of the State.*

A-2 Discrimination on the basis of age or sex

The commission believes that discrimination on the grounds of age or sex is inconsistent with full and meaningful opportunity to participate in the delegate selection process. Therefore, the Commission requires State Parties to eliminate all vestiges of discrimination on these grounds. Furthermore, the Commission requires State Parties to overcome the effects of past discrimination by affirmative steps to encourage representation on the national convention delegation of young people -- defined as people of not more than thirty nor less than eighteen years of age -- and women in reasonable relationship to their presence in the population of the State.* Moreover, the Commission requires State Parties to amend their party rules to allow and encourage any Democrat of eighteen years or more to participate in all party affairs.

When State law controls, the Commission requires State Parties to make all feasible efforts to repeal, amend, or otherwise modify such laws to accomplish the stated purposes.

A-3 Voter registration

The purpose of registration is to add to the legitimacy of the electoral process, not to discourage participation. Democrats do not enjoy an opportunity to participate fully in the delegate selection process in States where restrictive voter registration laws and practices are in force, preventing their effective participation in primaries, caucuses, conventions and other Party affairs. These restrictive laws and practices include annual registration requirements, lengthy residence requirements, literacy tests, short and untimely registration periods, and infrequent enrollment sessions.

The Commission urges each State Party to assess the burdens imposed on a prospective participant in the Party's delegate selection processes by State registration laws, customs and practices, as outlined in the report of the Grass Roots Subcommittee of the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, and use its good offices to remove or alleviate such barriers to participation.

A-4 Cost and fees; petition requirements

The Commission believes that costs, fees, or assessments and excessive petition requirements made by State Law and Party rule or still others, rules and laws regulate only the formal aspects of the selection process (e.g., date and place of the State Convention) and leave to Party resolution or tradition the more substantive matters (e.g., intrastate apportionment of votes; rotation of alternates; nomination of delegates).

The Commission believes that any of these arrangements is inconsistent with the spirit of the Call in that they permit excessive discretion on the part of Party officials, which may be used to deny or limit full and meaningful opportunity to participate. Therefore, the Commission requires State Parties to adopt and make available readily accessible Statewide Party rules and statutes that prescribe the State's delegate selection process with sufficient detail and clarity. When relevant to the State's delegate selection process, explicit written Party rules and procedural rules should include clear provisions for: (1) the apportionment of delegates and votes within the State; (2) the allocation of fractional votes, if

*It is the understanding of the Commission that this is not to be accomplished by the mandatory imposition of quotas.

any; (3) the selection and responsibilities of convention committees; (4) the nomination of delegates and alternates; (5) the succession of alternates to delegate status and the filling of vacancies; (6) credentials challenges; (7) minority reports.

Furthermore, the Commission requires State Parties to adopt rules that will facilitate maximum participation among interested Democrats in the processes by which National Convention delegates are selected. Among other things, these rules should provide for dates, times, and public places that would be most likely to encourage interested Democrats to attend all meetings involved in the delegate selection process.

The Commission requires State Parties to adopt explicit written Party rules that provide for uniform times and dates of all meetings involved in the delegate selection process. These meetings and events include caucuses, conventions, committee meetings, primaries, filing deadlines, and Party enrollment periods. Rules regarding time and date should be uniform in two senses. First, each stage of the delegate selection process should occur at a uniform time and date throughout the State. Second, the time and date should be uniform from year to year. The Commission recognizes that in many parts of rural America it may be an undue burden to maintain complete uniformity, and therefore exempts rural areas from this provision so long as the time and date are publicized in advance of the meeting and are uniform within the geographic area.

B-1 Proxy Voting

When a Democrat cannot, or chooses not to, attend a meeting related to the delegate selection process, many States allow that person to authorize another to act in his name. This practice -- called proxy voting -- has been a significant source of real or felt abuse of fair procedure in the delegate selection process.

The Commission believes that any situation in which one person is given the authority to act in the name of the absent Democrat, on any issue before the meeting, gives such person an unjustified advantage in affecting the outcome of the meeting. Such a situation is inconsistent with the spirit of equal participation. Therefore, the Commission requires State Parties to add to their explicit written rules provisions which forbid the use of proxy voting in all procedures involved in the delegate selection process.

B-2 Clarity of purpose

An opportunity for full participation in the delegate selection process is not meaningful unless each Party member can clearly express his preference for candidates for delegates to the National Convention, or for those who will select such delegates. In many States, a Party member who wishes to affect the selection of the delegation must do so by voting for delegates or Party officials who will engage in many activities unrelated to the delegate selection process.

Whenever other Party business is mixed, without differentiation, with the delegate selection process, the Commission requires State Parties to make it clear to voters how they are participating in a process that will nominate their Party's candidate for President. Furthermore, in States which employ a convention or committee system, the Commission requires State Parties to clearly designate the delegate selection procedures as distinct from other Party business.

B-3 Quorum provisions

Most constituted bodies have rules or practices which set percentage or number minimums before they can commence their business. Similarly, Party committees which participate in the selection process may commence business only after it is determined that this quorum exists. In some states, however, the quorum requirement is satisfied when less than 40% of committee members are in attendance.

The commission believes a full opportunity to participate is satisfied only when a rank-and-file Democrat's representative attends such committee meetings. Recognizing, however, that the setting of high quorum requirements may impede the selection process, the Commission requires State Parties to adopt rules setting quorums at not less than 40% for all Party committees involved in the delegate selection process.

B-4 Selection of Alternates; filling of delegate and alternate vacancies

The Call to the 1972 convention requires that the alternates be chosen by one of the three methods sanctioned for the selection of delegates -- i.e., by primary, convention or committee. In some states, party rules authorize the delegate himself or the State Chairman to choose his alternate. The Commission requires State Parties to prohibit these practices -- and other practices not specifically authorized by the Call -- for selecting alternates.

In the matter of vacancies, some States have Party rules that authorize the State Chairmen to fill all delegate and alternate vacancies. This practice again involved the selection of delegates or alternates by a process other than primary, convention or committee. The Commission requires State Parties to prohibit such practices and to fill all vacancies by (1) a timely and representative Party committee; or (2) a reconvening of the body that selected the delegate or alternate whose seat is vacant; or (3) the delegation itself, acting as a committee.

When State law controls, the Commission requires State Parties to make all reasonable efforts to repeal, amend or to otherwise modify such laws to accomplish the state purposes.

B-5 Unit rule

In 1968, many States used the unit rule at various stages in the processes by which delegates were selected to the National Convention. The 1968 Convention defined unit rule*, did not enforce the unit rule on any delegate in 1968, and added language to the 1972 Call requiring that "the unit rule not be used in any stage of the delegate selection process". In light of the Convention action, the Commission requires State Parties to add to their explicit written rules provisions that forbid the use of the unit rule or the practice of instructing delegates to vote against their stated preferences at any stage of the delegate selection process.**

*Unit rule. "This Convention will not enforce upon any delegate with respect to voting on any question or issue before the Convention any duty or obligation which said delegate would consider to violate his individual conscience. As to any legal, moral or ethical obligation arising from a unit vote or rule imposed either by State law by a State convention or State committee or primary election of any nature, or by a vote of a State delegation, the Convention will look to each individual delegate to determine for himself the extent of such obligation if any."

****It is the understanding of the Commission that the prohibition on instructed delegates applies to favorite-son candidates as well.**

C-1 Adequate public notice

The Call to the 1968 convention required State Parties to assure voters an opportunity to "participate fully" in party affairs. The Special Equal Rights Committee interpreted this opportunity to include adequate public notice. The Committee listed several elements -- including publicizing of the time, places and rules for the conduct of all public meetings of the Democratic Party and holding such meetings in easily accessible places -- which comprise adequate public notice. These elements were adopted by the Democratic National Committee in January 1968 as its official policy statement and are binding on the State Parties. Furthermore, the Commission requires State Parties to circulate a concise and public service in advance of the election itself of the relationship between the party business being voted upon and the delegate selection process.

In addition to supplying the information indicated above, the Commission believes that adequate public notice includes information on the ballot as to the presidential preference of (1) candidates or slates for delegate or (2) in the states which select or nominate a portion of the delegates by committees, candidates or slates for such committees.

Accordingly, the Commission requires State Parties to give every candidate for delegate (and candidate for committee, where appropriate) the opportunity to state his presidential preference on the ballot next to the name of every candidate for delegate (and candidate for committee, where appropriate) who does not wish to express a presidential preference.

When State law controls, the Commission requires the State Parties to make all feasible efforts to repeal, amend or otherwise modify such laws to accomplish the stated purpose.

C-2 Automatic (ex-officio) delegates (see also C-4)

In some states, certain public or Party officeholders are delegates to county, State and National Conventions by virtue of their official position. The Commission believes that State laws, Party rules and Party resolutions which so provide are inconsistent with the Call to the 1972 Convention for three reasons:

1. The Call requires all delegates to be chosen by primary, convention or committee procedures. Achieving delegate status by virtue of public or party office is not one of the methods sanctioned by the 1968 Convention.
2. The Call requires all delegates to be chosen by a process which begins within the calendar year of the Convention. Ex-officio delegates usually were elected (or appointed) to their positions before the calendar year of the Convention.
3. The Call requires all delegates to be chosen by a process in which all Democrats have a full and meaningful opportunity to participate. Delegate Selection by a process in which certain places on the delegation are not open to competition among Democrats is inconsistent with a full and meaningful opportunity to participate.

Accordingly, the Commission requires State Parties to repeal Party rules or resolutions which provide for ex-officio delegates. When State law controls, the Commission requires State Parties to make all feasible efforts to repeal, amend, or otherwise modify such laws to accomplish the stated purpose.

C-3 Open and Closed processes

The Commission believes that Party membership, and hence opportunity to participate in the delegate selection process, must be open to all persons who wish to be Democrats and who are not already members of another political party; conversely, a full opportunity for all Democrats to participate is diluted if members of other political parties are allowed to participate in the selection of delegates to the Democratic National Convention.

The Commission urges State Parties to provide for party enrollment that (1) allows non-Democrats to become Party members, and (2) provides easy access and frequent opportunity for unaffiliated voters to become Democrats.

C-4 Premature delegate selection (timeliness)

The 1968 Convention adopted language adding to the Call to the 1972 Convention the requirement that the delegate selection process must begin within the calendar year of the Convention. In many States, Governors, State Chairmen, State, district and county committees who are chosen before the calendar year of the convention, select -- or choose agents to select -- the delegates. These practices are inconsistent with the Call.

The Commission believes that the 1968 Convention intended to prohibit any untimely procedures which have any direct bearing on the processes by which National Convention delegates are selected. The process by which delegates are nominated is such a procedure. Therefore, the Commission requires State Parties to prohibit any practices by which officials elected or appointed before the calendar year choose nominating committees or propose or endorse a slate of delegates -- even when the possibility for a challenge to such slate or committee is provided.

When State law controls, the Commission requires State Parties to make all feasible efforts to repeal, amend, or modify such laws to accomplish the stated purposes.

C-5 Committee selection processes

The 1968 Convention indicated no preference between primary, convention, and committee systems for choosing delegates. The Commission believes, however, that committee systems by virtue of their indirect relationship to the delegate selection process, offer fewer guarantees for a full and meaningful opportunity to participate than other systems.

The Commission is aware that it has no authority to eliminate committee systems in their entirety. However, the Commission can and does require State Parties which elect delegates in this manner to make it clear to voters at the time the Party committee is elected or appointed that one of its functions will be the selection of National Convention delegates.

Believing, however, that such selection system is undesirable even when adequate public notice is given, the Commission requires State Parties to limit the National Convention delegation chosen by committee procedures to not more than 10 percent of the total number of delegates and alternates.

Since even this obligation will not ensure an opportunity for full and meaningful participation, the Commission recommends that State parties repeal rules or resolutions, which require or permit Party committees to select any part of the State's delegation to the National Convention. When State law controls, the Commission recommends that State Parties make all feasible efforts to repeal, amend, or otherwise modify such laws to accomplish the stated purpose.

C-6 Slate-making

In mandating a full and meaningful opportunity to participate in the delegate selection process, the 1968 Convention meant to prohibit any practice in the process of selection which made it difficult for Democrats to participate. Since the process by which individuals are nominated for delegate positions and slates of potential delegates are formed is an integral and crucial part of the process by which delegates are actually selected, the Commission requires State Parties to extend to the nominating process all guarantees of full and meaningful opportunity to participate in the delegate selection process. When State law controls, the Commission requires State Parties to make all feasible efforts to repeal, amend or otherwise modify such laws to accomplish the stated purpose.

Furthermore, whenever slates are presented to caucuses, meetings, conventions, committees, or to voters in a primary, the Commission requires State Parties to adopt procedures which assure that:

1. the bodies making up the slates have been elected, assembled, or appointed for the slate-making task with adequate public notice that they would perform such task;
2. Those persons making up each slate have adopted procedures that will facilitate widespread participation in the slate-making process, with the provision that any slate presented in the name of the presidential candidate in a primary State be assembled with due consultation with the presidential candidate or his representative.
3. adequate procedural safeguards are provided to assure that the right to challenge the presented slate is more than perfunctory and places no undue burden on the challengers.

When the State law controls, the Commission requires State Parties to make all feasible efforts to repeal, amend or otherwise modify such laws to accomplish the stated purposes.

REPUBLICAN DELEGATE SELECTION PROCESS

There is in the Republican Party no set of guidelines that parallels the McGovern-Fraser Recommendations of the Democratic Party. The following is only a general outline of the separate state's selection processes. The selection processes of each state are available.

The delegate selection process of the Republican Party, like that of the Democratic Party, generally breaks down into two distinctive processes: the primary election and the state convention. One or the other being employed in each state with slightly varying details. Each state's Republican Party decides what mechanisms will be used and in combination with the National Committee declares guidelines as to the proper methods of selection.

THE STATE CONVENTION

Several states select their voting delegates to the Republican National Convention by election at a state convention held expressly for that purpose. The delegates selected at the convention may make up the entire delegation or supplement in number those delegates selected through an alternate process. (No general provisions have been made specifying the percentage or number of those delegates that must be elected in an open and democratically comprised assembly.)

The delegates to the state convention are elected in a variety of ways. The most common procedure includes their election from a district or county convention. Delegates to the district convention are usually selected from precinct meetings held at some specified time before the state convention.

State convention rules provide for the election of both district and at-large delegates. The percentages of each are determined by the state Republican committees and approved by the state convention.

Alternate delegates are selected in each state in the same manner as the regular voting delegates.

THE STATE PRIMARY

The state primary system is employed by several state Republican Parties. The primary mechanisms generally consist of a delegate-candidate filing for election having made known his choice for the Republican presidential nomination. The electors then "vote" for their presidential candidate by selecting the delegate-candidate who reflects their own presidential choice.

The process, as noted of the state convention, has many variations. States are free to choose the percentage of district and at-large delegates that will be elected. Some states require that petitions be circulated before a delegate-candidate name may appear on the ballot. In some cases the elected delegates are bound to their presidential candidates until special provisions have been fulfilled. There are a number of systems that incorporate the primary system with another system with another more arbitrary one. Wisconsin, as an example provides for the election of slates of delegates submitted to the Secretary of State by presidential candidates. However, in the event that a write-in candidate or a candidate that does not declare his support of a presidential candidate, the state executive committee makes the delegate selection.

REFORM IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

During the 1968 convention the Convention Rules Committee approved and recommended to the full convention a relatively mild rule prohibiting discrimination in the

(over)

selection of future Convention delegates. The full convention approved the rule change without debate after the National Council of Concerned Afro-American Republicans failed to mount a floor fight for a thorough anti-discrimination report. The delegate who was to have offered the stiffer rule from the Convention floor, was off the floor when the Rules Committee report was approved.

Additionally, the Ripon Society has filed suit in District Court seeking to have the formula for allocating delegates to the Republican National Convention declared unconstitutional. They hope to re-establish the one-man-one-vote concept in terms of the convention and the delegate selection process.

THE STATE CONVENTION

Several states select their voting delegates to the Republican National Convention by election at a state convention held expressly for that purpose. The delegates selected at the convention may make up the entire delegation or supplement it with those delegates selected through an alternate process. (No general provisions have been made specifying the percentage or number of those delegates that must be elected in an open and democratically conducted assembly.)

The delegates to the state convention are elected in a variety of ways. The most common procedure includes their election from a district or county convention. Delegates to the district convention are usually selected from precinct meetings held at some specified time before the state convention.

State convention rules provide for the election of both district and at-large delegates. The percentages of each are determined by the state Republican committee and approved by the state convention.

Alternate delegates are selected in each state in the same manner as the regular voting delegates.

THE STATE PRIMARY

The state primary system is employed by several state Republican Parties. The primary mechanism generally consists of a delegate-candidate filing for election having made known his choice for the Republican presidential nomination. The electors then "vote" for their presidential candidate by selecting the delegate-candidate who reflects their own presidential choice.

The process, as noted of the state convention, has many variations. States are free to choose the percentage of district and at-large delegates that will be elected. Some states require that petitions be circulated before a delegate-candidate name may appear on the ballot. In some cases the elected delegates are bound to their presidential candidates until special provisions have been fulfilled. There are a number of systems that incorporate the primary system with another system with another more arbitrary one. Wisconsin, as an example provides for the election of states of delegates submitted to the Secretary of State by presidential candidates. However, in the event that a write-in candidate or a candidate that does not declare his support of a presidential candidate, the state executive committee makes the delegate selection.

REFORM IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

During the 1968 convention the Convention Rules Committee approved and recommended to the full convention a relatively mild rule prohibiting discrimination in the

COMMISSION ON PARTY STRUCTURE AND DELEGATE SELECTION

October 18, 1971

MEMORANDUM:

TO: State Democratic Party Leaders
FROM: Congressman Donald M. Fraser, Chairman
SUBJECT: Guidelines A-1 and A-2

On October 15, 1971 the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection adopted a statement on Guidelines A-1 and A-2 to aid State Democratic Parties in complying with these Guidelines. The statement is as follows:

The Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection is receiving numerous inquiries about the apparent inconsistency between the general, underlying theme of the Guidelines and the requirements of A-1 and A-2.

Under A-1 and A-2 the Commission set forth two requirements:

- that State Democratic Parties overcome the effects of past discrimination by affirmative steps to encourage the participation of minority groups, women and young people; and
- that these groups be represented on national convention delegations in reasonable relationship to their presence in the population, although the Commission denied any intention of establishing quotas for such groups.

How, it is asked, can Guidelines A-1 and A-2 be reconciled with the thrust of the Guidelines which aim at precluding a specified result in the delegate selection process and which require that the process be open to the full participation of all Democrats who, under democratic procedures, shall make the ultimate decision on the composition of the delegation?

The Guidelines are rooted in the historic truth that minority groups, women and young people have been vastly under-represented in past state delegations to national conventions.

Past discriminatory patterns and restrictive practices were so pervasive in many state parties that those who have been denied fair representation would have had to make extraordinary efforts to achieve enlarged representation in the parties' decision-making processes.

Thus the Commission placed on state parties the responsibility to correct this gross inequity and take affirmative steps to assure adequate representation in the future.

But minorities, women and young people also must assert their rights. They have a responsibility to participate and to use every means available to achieve recognition and election to delegate positions.

(over)

It should be clear also that when delegates are selected by voters at a primary or public election, a state party cannot be held responsible for the choice made by the voters, provided that the Democratic state party has done all that it can to achieve a reasonably balanced delegation.

There are several points in the delegate selection process at which the political party must act affirmatively to broaden representation in accordance with Guidelines A-1 and A-2. These occur especially under slate-making procedures. They include nominating committees as well as committees working under the direction of, or in consultation with, presidential candidates.

Thus, whenever an organized group meets to recommend, or nominate, or otherwise engage in procedures for the purpose of selecting delegates, it is reasonable to impose on such group the burden of seeking to achieve reasonable representation in its recommendations.

In addition, the Commission believes there are a number of affirmative steps that state parties can take to meet Guidelines A-1 and A-2 and encourage the widespread participation of all Democrats in the delegate selection process.

Grouping them in three broad categories -- publicity, education, and organization -- the Commission offers the following suggestions as examples of these steps:

Publicity

A. Plan a comprehensive publicity campaign utilizing all press outlets and media, to begin well in advance of the delegate selection process. In some states this will mean starting before the end of 1971. The purpose of the publicity campaign should be to inform people what the process is, how it works, when it starts, who is eligible, etc., and where to get additional information. In so doing:

1. Make up press kits and provide them to every daily and weekly newspaper as well as to the electronic media.
2. Include statements of the chairman and resolutions of the state party committee, if available, inviting all Democrats to participate.
3. Make a special effort to brief all political reporters on all aspects of the process.

B. If ethnic, black, language or other special media exists in a state, make certain they receive full information.

C. Issue follow-up statements urging full participation by all Democrats as the beginning of the process approaches.

Education

A. Hold "seminar" sessions for all party officers as necessary so they become fully informed and able to answer all questions on the process.

B. Schedule district or county meetings throughout the state to explain the process and answer questions.

C. Organize a speakers bureau of volunteers who will fully familiarize themselves with the local process and appear before groups of all kinds, as needed,

(more)

and give details of the process.

D. Prepare one-sheet briefs in large quantity for handout, giving essential data such as filing dates, meeting dates, etc. in a brief manner.

E. Prepare taped messages explaining the process, what the party has done and why it is important to participate --- as well as other essential information -- and send them out to party meetings.

HOW TO BECOME A DELEGATE TO THE 1972 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

1. Find out how delegates are elected in your state. A brief outline of the delegate selection process for each state is available. Learn this basic information.
2. Get a copy of your state party rules and familiarize yourself with the detailed procedures for delegate selection. Party rules must be readily available from state party headquarters. If they are not, let us know.
3. Find out whether the reform commission in your state is in the process of holding hearings or drafting new party rules. Attend reform commission meetings. Submit proposed rules or amendments to rules. KNOW THE GUIDELINES OF THE COMMISSION ON PARTY STRUCTURE AND DELEGATE SELECTION.
4. Know the times and dates of all meetings involved in delegate selection: slate-making caucuses, filing deadlines, and precinct, ward, township or legislative district meetings. IF YOU DON'T GET IN ON THE BOTTOM LEVEL, CHANCES ARE YOU WON'T GET IN AT ALL.
5. See if you have the proper qualifications. Must you have been a registered Democrat for a certain period of time? Is there a residency requirement? Is there a geographical distribution requirement for petition signatures? Is there a limited period of time for circulating petitions? Will you be first on the ballot if you file first? Must you have a presidential candidate's consent if you file pledged to him? When and what must you file with whom?
6. Know the nominating procedures (They must be included in party rules). Can you nominate yourself? Are nominations open from the floor? Do you file a declaration or candidacy? When and with whom? Is there a nomination committee? If so, how are the committee members selected? Can you be elected to the nominating committee?
7. Know how your state's delegation is apportioned. Will some delegates be elected at the Congressional District (or some other smaller unit) level? (NOTE: in convention systems, at least 75% of the delegation must be elected from units no larger than a Congressional District.) If so, are your chances of election better running at large or from the district? Is a part of your delegation selected by previously elected delegates or a committee procedure? By whom? Can you get elected by them?

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE NATIONAL YOUTH CAUCUS

Illinois Resolution -

The Illinois Resolution provides for proportional representation of minority youth on the steering committee of the National Youth Caucus. It also instructs the state caucuses to meet and discuss implementation of this decision.

Angela Davis Resolution -

The resolution passed by the Emergency Conference for New Voters concerning Angela Davis calls for her immediate release, on reasonable bail, and change of venue for her trial.

Native American Resolution -

An amendment sponsored by the Native American Caucus was approved by the Emergency Conference in plenary session. The resolution demands local control of educational systems in Indian communities and added emphasis on cultural education in Indian schools. The conference voted to support the efforts of Indians in their effort to obtain full participation in planning and administering of state and federal programs affecting the American Indian.

Resolutions of Chicano/Puerto Rican Caucus -

The Chicano/Puerto Rican Caucus included ten points: 1) Bi-lingual, bicultural education. 2) Self-determination of Puerto Rico as a sovereign state, commonwealth, or independent nation. 3) Decent housing and a voice in community housing. 4) Full employment for Chicanos and Puerto Ricans. 5) Guaranteed adequate income. 6) Guaranteed of adequate medical care for all people. 7) Federal subsidy in protection of ethnic cultures. 8) An end to all police brutality. 9) Massive immigration reform. 10) Removal of restrictive laws concerning formation of new political parties such as La Raza Unida.

Women's Caucus Resolution

The Women's Caucus passed six resolutions: 1) that the steering committee be comprised of one man and one woman from each state. 2) Adoption of the 27th Amendment, unamended, guaranteeing women full and equal rights. 3) that Rehnquist be denied a seat on the Supreme Court. 4) that a qualified woman be appointed to the Supreme Court immediately. 5) We will not support any candidate for any office who has not both demonstrated by past record and included in their current platform a commitment to appoint qualified women to high political positions. 6) that the credentials for seating of all state delegations be denied those states that do not have women represented proportionate to their number in that state.

1972 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Montana

Number of Delegates and Alternates

10 Delegates at Large
4 District Delegates

10 Alternate Delegates at Large
4 Alternate District Delegates

Total: 14 Delegates

14 Alternate Delegates

Method of Selection of Delegates

Delegates at large and district delegates are elected by a State Convention.

Delegates to the State Convention shall be chosen by county conventions composed of the county committeemen and county committeewomen elected from each precinct. Their election shall take place at the primary nominating election which is held the first Tuesday in June in general election years.

Method of Selection of Alternate Delegates

In the same manner as delegates

Date of Selection

June 4-5, 1972